

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the current application. Claims 4-6, 8, 9, 13-15, and 18-31 were withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement, leaving claims 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, and 17 examined in this Office Action. Claims 1-3, 7, 16, and 17 stand rejected as allegedly being anticipated. Claims 10-12 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 112

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner states that “it is unclear what is actually being claimed in the last 3 lines” of claim 2 regarding the wing portions. The Examiner further states, “[i]t is unclear what datum or reference point is being used with respect to this limitation.”

More specifically, the Examiner believes it is unclear with respect to what other element of the invention the wing portions are transversely further outside of the rails. Applicant believes the language is sufficiently clear and definite as it stands, and therefore traverses the Examiner’s section 112 rejection for the reasons explained below.

In an exemplary embodiment as shown in Fig. 3, it is clear that the flat portions 7, which serve as rails (see page 9, lines 2-3), are outside protruding portions 3 and 4 (see page 8, lines 24-25). Furthermore, the wing portions 5 and 6 are clearly formed outside of both the protruding portions and the flat portions. Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill would easily understand that a transverse outer direction extends to the horizontal edges of the figure. Therefore, claim 2 is believed to be clear and definite as written, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejection of claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 7, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Katoh et al ('044). By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 to incorporate the features from allowable claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 10 is cancelled by this amendment. Claims 11 and 12, as well as withdrawn claim 13, have been amended such that they depend from claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 7, 16, and 17 were previously dependent from claim 1. As such, all dependent claims depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as by virtue of the additional features set forth therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of all rejected claims and indicate that claims 1-3, 7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 are allowable.

Moreover, Applicant believes claim 1 is immediately allowable, and requests the Examiner to rejoin all previously withdrawn claims that are properly dependent from generic claim 1, namely claims 4-6, 8, 9, 13-15, 18 and 19.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/SMG/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 7, 2008

Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818